

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/689,463	10/20/2003	Hans Michael Ockenfels	01840.0001-US-01	4148
22865 7	590 09/07/2005	EXAMINER		INER
ALTERA LAW GROUP, LLC			SHAY, DAVID M	
SUITE 100	EST PARKWAY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55344-7704		3739		

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/689,463	OCKENFELS, HANS MICHAEL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	david shay	3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
·— ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>October 20, 2003</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
2a) This action is FINAL.2b) This3) Since this application is in condition for allowards.		secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objected to by the E	e: a) \square accepted or b) \boxtimes objected or drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date October 20, 2003.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

The drawings are objected to because none of the elements in Figure 1 are labeled with indicia indicative of their function and the designations of the axes of Figure 2 are not in English. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 31 positively recites the skin. the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. Blarg

the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. blarg

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Page 3

Claims 8-10 and 34-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8-10 are indefinite because they recite only structure and do no positively recite method steps. Claims 34-37, 46, and 47 are indefinite as they fail to further limit the claim from which they depend, as they recite no structure and therefore what further limitation is intended to be implied is unclear. Claim 38 is indefinite as it fails to further limit the claim from which it depends, as it recites structure which is inherent in claim 25 in order for that claim to describe a device which functions as claimed and therefore what further limitation is intended to be implied is unclear.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 25, 26, 28, 34-38, 40, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Chernoff.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3739

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 11-19, 23, 24, 29, 30, 35-38, 40-42, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff in combination with Sator et al. Chernoff teaches a device and method for treating the skin wherein the skin depth is determined at each point of treatment and the treatment laser power is adjusted for the depth at each point. Sator et al teach that PUVA treated skin experiences accelerated thinning which is correlated with the PUVA compaired to the skin of people who have not undergone PUVA. It would have been obvious to the artisan or ordinary skill to measure the skin thickness of patients who are undergoing PUVA, as taught by Chernoff in the device and method of Sato et al, since this would enable the dosages to be minimized for each patient and thus mitigate the skin thinning due to PUVA, thus producing a device and method such as claimed.

Claims 8-10, 20-22, 27, 31-33, 39, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff in combination with Sator et al as applied to claims 1-7, 11-19, 23, 24, 29, 30, 35-38, 40-42, and 47 above, and further in combination with Mueller et al.

Mueller et al teach the incorporation of a laser and ultrasound applicator in a single instrument. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to provide the laser and ultrasound applicator in the device and method of Chernoff in combination with Sator et al, since the separated ultrasound and laser applicators and combined applicators are equivalents, as shown by Mueller et al, or, alternatively, to employ the method and device of Chernoff in combination with Sator et al in the method and device of Mueller et al, since Mueller et al discuss no therapy of no

particular condition and in either case, to employ a mirror arm to conduct the radiation, since this is equivalent to the use of fiber optics and can more efficiently transmit ultraviolet light, official notice of which is hereby taken, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 15, 34, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff in combination with Sator et al as applied to claims 1-7, 11-19, 23, 24, 29, 30, 35-38, 40-42, and 47 above, and further in combination with Bonis et al. Bonis et al teach increasing the dosage of UV light in psoriasis plaques that do not respond to a base level of therapy, and continuing the increase until a response is seen. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the dosage increase technique of Bonis et al the the combined device and method of Chernoff in combination with Sator et al, since this yields better results, as taught by Bonis et al, thus producing a method and device such as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to david shay whose telephone number is (571) 272-4773. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak, can be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/689,463

Art Unit: 3739

Page 6

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAVID M. SHAY PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 330